REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended. Support for the amended features may be found in the specification at least at page 14, line 22 - page 15, line 10. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I.   Claim 1 Satisfies 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action asserts that there is no antecedent basis for the recitation "the data." By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II.   The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A.   Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 17-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 and 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,513 to Prithviraj et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,932 to Dadiomov et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references teach or suggest a method for operating a Web-based management system that includes "providing a runtime support to ensure that the data is atomically processed per event without being interrupted, wherein the runtime support includes an event queue that operates on a first-in-first-out basis," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 11. Similarly, none of the applied references teach or suggest a data presentation system that includes "a runtime support to ensure that the web object processes events atomically so that the processing cannot be interrupted, wherein the runtime support includes an event queue that operates on a first-in-first-out basis," as recited in claim 21.

That is, by providing runtime support that includes an event queue that operates on a first-in-first-out basis, events can be transmitted from the queue to specified destinations in order in which they are received, providing a guaranteed event delivery system. See, e.g., page 14, lines 22-31. Further, by providing runtime support that manages the processing of events by the Web objects, contention and race conditions can be avoided when one Web-object's state machine reads or writes the data in another Web object. See, e.g., page 15, lines 6-9.

None of the applied references teach or suggest a system or method for operating a web-based management system or a system that includes such an operation. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Prithviraj is devoid of a runtime support to ensure that the data is atomically processed, as set forth in claim 1, and as similarly set forth in claims 11 and 21. However, Dadiomov does not remedy this deficiency.

Dadiomov does not teach or suggest a system or method that processes data nor provides runtime support as recited in the independent claims. Dadiomov discloses a method and system for processing distributed transactions that integrate the execution of operations of a transaction on separate computers with exactly-once in order message delivery of a message queuing system. The exactly-once in-order delivery of Dadiomov is achieved by the use of a message identification assigned to each message. If the sequence number of the newly received message is greater than the stored sequence number of the last delivered message by more than one, the server of Dadiomov simply throws the message out because the message has been delivered out of order. See, e.g., Dadiomov, col.7, line 55 - col.8, line 11. Thus, Dadiomov does not disclose "runtime support to ensure that the web object processes events atomically so that the processing cannot be interrupted, wherein the runtime support includes an event queue that operates on a first-in-first-out basis."

Thus, claims 1, 11 and 21, and the claims dependent therefrom, would not have been rendered obvious by Prithviraj and Dadiomov. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B.   Rejection of Claims 13-16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Prithviraj in view of Dadiomov and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,933 to Mitchell et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dadiomov and Mitchell do not remedy the deficiencies of Prithviraj with respect to claim 11. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 11. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11, claims 13-16 would not have been rendered obvious by Prithviraj in view of Dadiomov and Mitchell. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/tbh

Date: June 20, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037